re: Reduction in the Divisible Pool of Taxes and Grant-in-Aid to the Mysore State

Sri G. CHANDRAKANTH (Bidar).—I call the attention of the Minister for Finance, Planning and Youth Welfare to the reduction of Rs. 18 crores in the divisible pool of taxes and grant-in-aid to Mysore State.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The reply covers the other calling attention notice by Sri D. B. Kalmankar also which relats to the same Subject.

† Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Minister for Finance, Planning and Youth Welfare).—Honourable Members have expressed their disappointment and sense of anxiety following the Press Reports of the Recommendations of the Fifth Finance Commission, which are since stated to have been accepted by the Government of India. Under these Recommendations, the total devolution of resources to Mysore State during the Fourth Five Year Plan period would stand at Rs. 197.42 Crores, as against a devolution of Rs. 215.42 Crores which the State received under the Fourth Finance Commission Award. The reduction of Rs. 18 Crores effected in the case of Mysore State alone, when all other States in the country have been given increases, is a matter of deep concern to Government. Our surprise and shock at this patently inequitable Award has been communicated in the strongest possible terms to the Prime Minister.

2. There might be an impression that since the Finance Commission's Award must be based upon the material placed before it by the State Government, the presentation of our case was less than adequate. I may assure the Hon'ble Members that this impression would be far from correct. In fact, the Finance Commission appreciated the manner in which the State Government placed its case, and the objective considerations that it brought to bear on its financial position. The Commission have recorded their appreciation of the presentation and have complimented the State on its detailed factual data that was placed before the Commission.

3. The reasons for the Award of the Commission are, therefore, all the more baffling. I should like to refresh the memory of the House about some salient points of our case.

4. Our forecast of Revenue Receipts and Expenditure on Revenue Account during the five year period 1969–74, placed Receipts at Rs. 802.64 and expenditure at Rs. 1078.82 Crores, resulting in a deficit of Rs. 276.18 Crores. This estimate of Receipts and Expenditure naturally excluded the State's share of Central Taxes as well as Grant under Article 275 of the Constitution, as these were required to be determined by the Finance Commission. The deficit of Rs. 276.18 Crores was also, it might be emphasised, without taking into account the following items of additional expenditure, in respect of all of which,

with the possible exclusion of the last item, commitments were of sizable magnitude, were estimated to arise during the five year period from 1969–74 :

		(Rs. in Crores)
1.	Pay Revision arising out of Tukol Commission ...	60.00
2.	Extra cost on account of grant of DA, as in the case of Central Government employees ...	14.00
3.	Compensation to Village Servants on account of abolition of hereditary offices ...	3 30
4.	Subsidy in rate of interest in respect of schemes financed by Agricultural Refinance Corporation and Scheduled Banks ...	2.00
5.	Loss of revenue if Prohibition was reintroduced ...	25.50
	Total ...	104.80

5. Our case before the Finance Commission was, accordingly, that the devolution of Taxes and Grants by the Centre should at least meet in full the likely deficit of Rs. 380. 98 Crores, *i.e.*, Rs. 276.18 Crores on the existing basis of Revenues and Expenditure and Rs. 104. 80 Crores on the basis of fresh commitments. Besides, we had urged that our State having surplus Power faced certain difficulties in the matter of Tariff rates and the Electricity Board had to be subsidised on account of concessions to Industries, loss on account of Rural Electrification etc., and the Commission was requested to take this into also account. We also made a special plea for making good loss of revenue if Octroi was abolished. Even omitting these, our demands were reasonable and against this we see that the State is to be given only Rs. 197.42 Crores as follows :

Devolution of Taxes	...	Rs. 179.43 Crores
Grants under Article 275	...	Rs. 17.99 Crores
Total	...	Rs. 197.42 Crores

6. Even these figures will show how inequitable the Award of the Finance Commission is. It is a matter of great regret to us that a *quasi judicial* body like the Commission does not appear to have taken an objective view and that its Award will result in still further widening the gap between well developed States and States which are yet relatively under developed. We have not received an official copy of the report of the Commission, but gathering from Press Reports, some of the criteria which have been taken into account by the Commission have led to a serious distortion and are likely to make the rich States richer and the poor States poorer. I will go so far as to say that the Commision appear to have been misled in the manner of their assessment.

(SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE)

7. While in the case of Income Tax the Divisible Pool has been enhanced and there is no particular cause for complaint, in the case of Union Excise Duties, wherein one-fifth of the total collections constitute the Divisible Pool for distribution to the States, a very serious injustiec appears to have been done. The Commission have proposed that two-thirds of 20 per cent of the Divisible Pool, should be distributed among States having a lower than the All India average per capita income. The actual disbursement has to be in proportion to the shortfall of the respective State income from the All India income multiplied by the population of the State. The remaining one-third is to be given on the basis of backwardness of the Region. The result of the application of this formula is that Mysore's share of the Union Excise Duties gets reduced from 5.4 per cent under the Fourth Finance Commission's Award to 4. 65 per cent. In itself, this will constitute a reduction of the devolution by Rs. 15 Crores. In regard to additional Excise Duties, where 97.03 per cent of the total collections are to be distributed to the States, Mysore is to get 6 per cent, with a guaranteed minimum of Rs. 100.10 lakhs. This figure is the same as it was under the Fourth Finance Commissions' Award, and the small increase in percentage for distribution to the State (6 per cent as against 5.4 per cent) is unlikely to benefit the State.

8. Taking the devolution of all taxes as a whole, Mysore State which used to get 5.1 per cent of the total, is now to receive only 4.94 per cent.

9. It is in respect of the Grants-in-aid under Article 275 of the Constitution, however, that the State appears to have suffered most. The Fourth Finance Commission had awarded Rs. 20.82 Crores per annum amountiug to Rs. 104.10 Crores for the five year period. As against this, the Fifth Finance Commission has recommended a grant of Rs. 17.99 Croses for the five year period 1969–74. The Grant-in-aid is computed after taking into account the net deficit remaining over in the State, after providing for part of the deficit by the devolution of Taxes. From this point of view, out of a deficit of Rs. 380.98 Crores a sum of Rs. 179.43 Crores having been covered by devolution of Taxes, it was necessary that the state should be given a Grant-in-aid covering the balance, namely, Rs. 201.55 Crores. Even if some allowance had to be made for the fact that there might be no loss of revenue on account of reintroduction of Prohibition, the deficit to be covered by Grant would still to be as high as Rs. 175 Crores. Instead of meeting our legitimate request for covering this deficit by *ad hoc* grant, the Commission have reduced the grant to the extremely low figure of Rs. 17.99 Crores, which is just 10 per cent of what we should have received.

10. Taking the total picture of devolution, in the form of both Taxes as well as Grants-in-aid, the State is to receive on a per capita basis, Rs. 83.65 as against Rs.91.28 in the Fourth Finance Commission

period. This reduction by Rs. 8.36 contrasts strangely with the increases, varying from Rs. 2.56 to Rs. 106.34 which the Commission has awarded to the other States. These details may be seen in the statement enclosed.

11. We are unable to understand the rationale behind the Award. In this connection, I would like to make a reference to the position revealed for some other States. There are seven States, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Maharashtra, Madya Pradesh, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh, in respect of which substantial devolutions of Taxes have been recommended by the Co mission. These seven States, according to all the available information, were in a position to show substantial revenue surpluses even without the benefit of the upward revisions made by the Fifth Finance Commission over the Fourth Finance Commission's figures. This only means that there are States which have received guaranteed devolution of Taxes regardless of the fact whether they were deficit or surplus, and that in respect of all the other States except Mysore, where a deficit was clearly demonstrated, the Commission has come in with substantial grants-in-aid to meet these deficits. As things stand, we would neither be in the category of States which will record substantial surplus through the five year period, nor will we receive sufficient assistance from the Government of India to correct the deficits.

12. Surprising as these facts are, the most distressing feature is that the extraordinary efforts made by the State in raising resources whether from Excise Duties or from other sources, have led to a situation where we are being penalised for prudence. There are States which have abolished Land Revenue, which have introduced food subsidies and which have generally followed the path of easy popularity. The Finance Commission have apparently favoured assisting these States with substantial grants, while in the case of our State, the Commission have found themselves unable to meet even in part the substantial deficit that will arise.

13. The blind application of what is being enshrined as a principle but which should, in fact, have been applied with due regard to all circumstances, is the distribution based on the level of per capita income and regional backwardness. It so happens that the Government of India have placed Mysore State just marginally above the level of average per capita income in the country. In fact, this does not make us by any means a prosperous State, or a State whose Government have no problems of deficits in their Budget. But it has been used both by the Planning Commission and by the Finance Commission to reduce the allotment of funds to the State. There are States which have higher per capita income than the national average, but their problems have been looked after by the very large devolution of Taxes. There are other States which may be below the national per capita income, and they are to be helped by substantial grants. We who are on the margin

(SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE)

are to be penalised on what amount to theoretical consideration, to the extent of Rs. 15 to 20 crores per year in respect of the Finance Commission's Award, and about Rs. 6 crores per year in respect of Plan assistance.

14. This matter is so serious that we shall not rest until and unless the Government of India is able to do justice to us. If the tempo of activity on the Plan and Non-Plan side is to be maintained at any reasonable level, the State must be given an additional amount of the order already indicated to the Finance Commission. If the Government of India do not see their way to come to our assistance, not only will the overdrarft—which we have tided over again by our own efforts—recur and grow bigger, but also there will be widespread dissatisfaction in the State, and the Government of India will have to hold themselves responsible for any situation that may occur.

15. We only hope that, even now, the Government of India will review the matter further and that they will see that the legitimate interests of the State are not made to suffer in this way. We are determined that merely because a State has been reasonable in its demands, it should not happen that the Commission overlook almost entirely the heavy burdens that the State faces in carrying through its development programmes and the general prudence, rectitude with which it has managed its financial affairs. All the good work done in these past years, and the tempo of development that has been created, will come grindingly to a halt, unless the Government of India takes note of the seriousness of the situation and intervenes without delay.

STATEMENT SHOWING PER CAPITA ALLOCATION OF TAXES AND GRANTS

STATE	Population (in Millions)	Fourth Finance Commission		Fifth Finance Commission		Percentage increase in per capita allocation over IV Finance Commission award.
		Total (Rs. in crores)	Per-capita (Rs.)	Total (Rs. in crores)	Per-capita (Rs.)	
Andhra Pradesh ...	36.0	234.18	65.06	339.25	94.24	44.85
Assam ...	11.9	144.96	121.82	195.21	164.04	34.66
Bihar ...	46.5	197.46	42.46	407.38	87.61	106.34
Gujarat ...	20.6	121.55	59.00	182.75	88.71	50.36
Haryana ...	7.5	39,19	51.57	59.61	78.43	52.08
Kerala ...	16.9	188.61	111.60	193.43	114.46	2.56
Punjab ...	11.1	57.51	51.81	89.16	80.32	55.03
Jammu and Kashmir ...	3.6	66.10	183.61	106.84	296.78	61.64
Madhya Pradesh ...	32.4	162.03	50.01	274.02	84.57	69.11
Tamil Nadu ...	33.7	207.32	61.52	295.11	87.57	42.34
Maharashtra ...	39.6	260.38	65.75	383.66	96.88	47.35
Mysore ...	*23.6*	*215.42*	*91.28*	*197.42*	*83.65*	*-8.36*
Nagaland ...	0.4	58.46	146.15	80.72	201·80	38.08
Orissa ...	17.5	231.85	132.49	250.68	143.25	8.12
Rajasthan ...	20.2	130.41	64.56	221.65	109.73	69·97
Uttar Pradesh ...	73.7	373 02	50.61	620.12	84.14	66.25
West Bengal ...	34.9	197.41	56.56	369.03	105.74	86.95
ALL STATES	430.2	2885.86		4266.04		

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I would like to ask one clarification from the Hon. Minister for Finance. We are indeed thankful to him for having given a very clear picture of what is to come to us as a result of the Fifth Finance Commission's Report. I want him to see that the Statement is got printed and circulated to the members, so that they can go through it and examine the whole situation.

Secondly, what I heard from his speech is that he has used the strongest terms that any State Government could use against the Central Government regarding the discriminatory treatment given to Mysore State. Anybody on this side could not have done better than what the Hon. Minister has done. The Report of the Finance Commission is a report of the statutory body constituted under the Constitution of India and from what we read in the papers we understand that the Central Government has accepted it. I do not know whether the State Government has received any official communication in this regard. If the Central Government does not revise its decision, then what we have got is just sufficient only for the purpose of paying our officers and nothing would be left from the State's finances for any development work. When such is the position I would like to know from the Government, what would be the reaction of the party in power ? Would you like to protest and take such steps as would be necessary to make the Central Government open its eyes and see that the injustice done to the State is redressed or would you simply like to wail and weep on the plea that the party in power at the Centre is the same as it is here ? If you are simply to wail and weep, people would not tolerate it. You may not have any receptive treatment from the Centre because it is the statutory body that has given its report. In fact, I have no reason to believe that you are not an able Minister or that our case has not been properly placed before the Finance Commission. I have no reason to come to that conclusion. There must be some reason for this. It must be no other reason except political reason. If that were so, how are you going to overcome it ? In this matter I would earnestly appeal to every member on the other side not to treat this matter on party basis. We are one with you so far as this issue is concerned. You must try to mend it. You must come with us and see that some agitation is started in the State and see that this matter is redressed.

2-30 P. M.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸಚಿವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಂತೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ನೆರವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಾದ ನಿರಾಶಾ ಭಾವನೆಯುಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ಇವರಿಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಆಂಕಿಗಳು ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಭೂಸ್ಪೈಡ್ ಫಿಗರ್ಸ್ ಎಂದು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಅಂತಹ ಒಂದು ತಪ್ಪು ಸ್ಟಾಟಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ಸ್‌ನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿನವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯದು ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಗೂ ಬೆಟರುಮೆಂಟು ಲೆವಿ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ರೈತರಮೇಲೆ ಹೇರಿ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಇಂತಹ ಭೂಸ್ಪೈಡ್ ಫಿಗರ್ಸ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು. ಅವರೇ ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಆಬಾಲಿಷನ್‌ಗಾಗಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಹೊಸ ಹೊಸ ಸಬ್‌ಸಿಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವಾಗ ಈ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ನೆರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ

ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಕಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರದವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಒಂದು ಚಿತ್ರ ಕೊಡದೇ ತಪ್ಪು ಚಿತ್ರವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇಂತಹ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದ ಹಿತವನ್ನು ಅಲಕ್ಷಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ವಿಷಾದದಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಕೇಂದ್ರದವರೊಡನೆ ಕುಳಿತು ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾದ ಚಿತ್ರವನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮನವರಿಕೆಯಾಗುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ನಮ್ಮ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಬೇರೆ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನಮಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತೋರಿಸಲೇಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

† Sri D. B. KALMANKAR.—It is said in paragraph 14 that this matter is so serious that we shall not rest until and unless the Government of India is able to do justice to us. It seems you are sincere about taking some action so as to compel the Government of India to redress our grievances. If that is so, what concrete action are you proposing to take to compel the Government of India to set right the things and do justice to us ? Secondly, you have also stated that there are some other States which have got *per capita* income more than the national *per capita* income. What was the reason which was substantially considered for giving more grants to those States and why the same treatment was not given to us ? Probably what we feel is that there is some political cause rather than any other cause and secondly you have not given any specific programme relating to backward parts of the State. Probably you have only given your report and your memorandum without considering the special cases of some backward parts of the State. A doubt arises whether the same thing was done to other States also. All these things may be explained.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಹುಚ್ಚಮಾಸ್ತಿಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾದಂಥ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶಿವಪ್ಪನವರು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯ ದೊರಕುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನು ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಮಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ 5 ವರ್ಷದಿಂದಲೂ ಮಳೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ರಿಮಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ವಸೂಲ್ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಕಂದಾಯ ಬಾಕಿ 26 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ವಸೂಲ್ಮಾಡಬೇಡವೇ ? ಮತ್ತೆ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಟರ್‌ನಲ್ ರಿಸೋರ್ಸಸ್ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇದನ್ನು ವಸೂಲ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಾ ? ಆ ಒಂದು ವಸೂಲ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನೂ ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಎಲ್ಲೂ ಹಾಕದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ವಾಟರ್ ರೇಟ್ ವಸೂಲು ಆಗುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ. ಮತ್ತೆ ಹೊಸ ಕಂದಾಯ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅವೆರ್ಲಾ ವಸೂರಾಗುತ್ತೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ? ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆದಾಯ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಆ ಅಂಕ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಆ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನೂ ಒಂದನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಿ. ಇಷ್ಟೆರ್ಲಾ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ರೆಕ್ಯಾಚಾರ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡರೆ 5ನೆಯ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನೂ ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಆರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಪಟ್ಟಿಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದೆ ನಮಗೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯಕವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

† ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಎಸ್. ಅರಕೇರಿ.—ಈಗ 5ನೆಯ ಕಮೀಷನ್ನಿನಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಈಗ ಕಣ್ಣು ತೆರೆದಿದೆ ; ಜನತೆಯೂ ಕಣ್ಣು ತೆರೆದಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದು ಬಹುಶಃ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ಪ್ರಭಾವಶಾಲಿಗಳಾಗಲ, ರಾಜಕಾರಿಣಿಗಳಾಗಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿರಬಹುದು ಅಥವಾ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದೊಂದಿಗೆ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದ ಬೇಡಿಕೆ ಇರಲಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಸಹಕರಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದಕೊಂಡು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣನ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೆಗಡೆಯವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ 5ನೇ ಫೈನಾನ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ವಿಷಯ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಇನ್ ಏಡ್ ಕೊಡುವುದರಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ತೀರ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಒಂದರಲ್ಲೇ ಹೀಗೆ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಇನ್ನು 5ನೆಯ ಕಮಿಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಏನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಬಹುದು? ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಇನ್ ಏಡ್ ಬೇರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪಶ್ಚಿಮ ಬಂಗಾಳಕ್ಕೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೇನಾದರೂ ಸಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? ನಾನು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ಓದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಸಕಾರಣಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡದೆ ಮೈಸೂರು ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನು ಇತರ 2-3 ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈವೊತ್ತು ಉತ್ತಮವಾದ ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಇದೆ? ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಇನ್ ಏಡ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿರುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಸೇರಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಾಯಪಡಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಿದ್ದವೀರಪ್ಪನವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಕೇಂದ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಆ ರೀತಿ ರಾಜಕೀಯವಾಗಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬೇರೆಯವರು ಎಷ್ಟು ದೂರ ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇರೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಶಕ್ತಿ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲವಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಮಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಬಿ. ಹ್ಯಾಲನಯ್ಯ.—ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಪ್ರಾಂತೀಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳಿಗೆ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಏನು ಕ್ರೈಟೀರಿಯಾ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿದೆ? ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ದೆಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರು ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳ ಹಿಂದುಳಿದಿರುವಿಕೆ, ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗದೇ ಉಳಿದಿರುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು, ಪರ್ ಕ್ಯಾಪಿಟಾ ಇನ್‌ಕಂ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಕ್ರೈಟೀರಿಯಾ ಹಾಕುವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಏನಾದರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ.—ಹಣಕಾಸು ಆಯೋಗದವರು ಕಾಂಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟದ್ದು ಏಕೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇವರು ಕಾಂಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿರಬಹುದು. ಇವರ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ಅಳತೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ಭಾಗ ಏನು ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯ ಕಾಂಪ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇವರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಹಾದೇವ್ ಜಿ. ಬಣಕಾರ್.—ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಭಾವವಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಣಕಾಸು ಆಯೋಗದವರಿಗೆ ಬೋಗಸ್ ಅಂಕಿ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ವಸೂಲಾತಿ ಆಗದೆ ಇರುವುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಸೇರಿಸಿ, ಕೈಗಡ ಹುಟ್ಟುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಲಯಬಿಲಿ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅಸ್ತಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ತೋರಿಸುವ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಸ್ಥರಂತೆ, ರಿಸೋರ್ಸಸ್ ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದು ನಮಗೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಹಣ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳ ಹಿರಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನು, ಕೆಲವರನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿ, ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅಂಕಿಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಮನವಿಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಕಳಿಸಿಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಾ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ?

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—Sir, With reference to the request of the Hon'ble Sri N. Hutchmasthi Gowda that copies of the memorandum submitted by the State Government to the Finance Commission be made available to the Hon. Members, I would like to say that they have already been made available to the Hon. Members.

This is not the first time that I appeared before the Finance Commission. This is the second time. As Hon. Member might recall, in 1965-66, the Fourth Finance Commission was appointed to

visit the Various States and it made certain recommendations to the Government of India and the Government In lia accepted the recommendations. According to the award of the Fourth Finance Commission, we were one of the few States that got substantial financial assistance both under devolution of the taxes in the divisible pool as well as assistance under the grant-in-aid under article 275. Therefore, it is not as if we have submitted to the Fifth Finance Commission a case which was either weak or which was not convincing. But it was a fact that the composition of the Second Finance Commission was different. Now at this stage, I would not like to make an indictment against the Finance Commission which is a statutory body and which is a quasi-judicial body, that it was motivated by political considerations. Without having sufficient material, it would be unfair on my part to make any such aspersions on the Commission. But what has totally baffled me is this : The Finance Commission, unlike the previous Finance Commissions, went to examine the backwardness of the various States. This, in my humble opinion, was perhaps in excess of its jurisdiction. The functions of the Finance Commission as are enumerated in the Constitution, and also as had been the practice, were :—(1) to determine after a thorough examination of both revenue and expenditure on revenue account in every State what would be the net dificit or surplus over a period of next five years and on the basis of either surplus or deficit to make recommendations as to what is the quantum of assistance which the State should get under article 275. (2) what are the principles and methods on the basis of which devolution of resources should take place out of the divisible pool of taxes in the Central Government.

But the Finance Commission according to my humble opinion has gone one step further to examine what should be the criteria of distribution of resources out of the divisible pool. This was not perhaps envisaged, even in the terms of reference under which the Finance Commission was constituted. Sri Siddaveerappa asked me what are the concrete steps that are going to be taken if the Central Government says it is rather too late? and that they have already accepted the recommendations of the Finance Commission? Sir, it is rather premature for me to say anything about the possible steps the State Government might take, because we have yet to discuss with the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister of the Government of India. I do not think even now it is too late. May be, according to the convention, the Government of India has to accept the award. Whether it agrees in its totality or not, it has to accept the award of the Finance Commission. So far in the history of our country, after Independence, there has not been any exception. But if the Government of India feels that in a particular cas injustice has been done or particular aspects of the case of a particular State have not been taken into account or appreciated adequately by the Finance Commission, the Government of India can make certain *ad hoc* grants to such states. Therefore, it is rather premature to envisage what are the steps that we may have to take or compelled to take if Mysore Governments' plea goes unheeded.

(SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE)

Our Hon. Chief Minister has already left for Delhi today. He is going to meet the Hon. Prime Minister and have preliminary discussion and this matter will come in the next meeting of the National Development Council. Sir, I am really very deeply disappointed by the award of the Finance Commission. It appears as if our State was the only State which was singled out and deprived of its due share in the divisible Central pool of taxes and grant-in-aid. I do not want to make any harsher statement but I must repeat that I share the concern and anxiety of the hon. Members and I will do my very best to see that the injustice done is remedied.

Sri BOLA RAGHURAMA SHETTY.—Cannot the Government challenge the Report of the Commission in a court of law on the ground that it has gone beyond its jurisdiction ?

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—This is a matter which needs thorough examination. How can I say offhand whether we can take legal action ?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Please see that this statement as well as the figures are circulated among the Members so that we may also make a study. Let us not come to conclusions without knowing what the facts are.

Petition *re* : Charges on Irrigation Pumpsets charged by the M.S.E.B.

Presentation

Sri N. B. SIRDESAI (Belgaum).—I present the petition regarding exemption of minimum charges levied by the M.S.E.B. on Irrigation pumpsets during non-working period in Khanapur Taluk.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The petition, which is presented now, stands referred to the Committee of Petitions.

Eighteenth Report of the Business Advisory Committee

Presentation

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I present the 18th Report of the Business Advisory Committee. I will put it to vote. The question is:

"That this House approves the 18th Report of the Business Advisory Committee."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The report is adopted.